

30

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

W.P.No. 6591 of 2005

PETITIONER

Jawaharlal Sisodiya, aged about 33 years, son of Shri Amar Singh, Sisodiya, Sub Inspector Police, Police Station Civil Line, Bilaspur(CG)

Versus

RESPONDENTS

- 1 Union of India, Through The Secretary, Personnel and Training Department, III Floor, Lok Nayak Bhawan, Khan Market, New Delhi.
- 2 State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Department of General Administration (State Reorganization Cell), Mantralaya Dau Kalyan Singh Bhawan, Raipur(CG)
- 3 State of Madhya Pradesh, Through: The Secretary, Department of Home (Police) Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal(MP)
- 4 Shri Khuman Singh Dhruw, Sub Inspector Police, Police Station District Kanker(CG)

**WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA**

Appearance:

Shri P.K.C. Tiwari, Sr. Advocate with Shri Rakesh Thakur, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri Ajay Barik, Advocate appears on behalf of Shri S.K. Beriwal, Counsel for respondent No.1/Union of India.

Shri Sumit Verma, Panel Lawyer for the State/respondent No.2.

None for other respondent.

ORAL ORDER
(10.12.2007)

SUNIL KUMAR SINHA, J.

Heard.

Learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner argues that this matter relates to final allocation of the petitioner after reorganization of the State of Madhya Pradesh in the year 2000. According to him the allocation should have



been completed at the earliest just after reorganization of the erstwhile State of Madhya Pradesh as per the provisions of Madhya Pradesh Reorganization Act, 2000. He submits that till today, the case pertaining to allocation of the petitioner has not been finalized. He very specifically submits that in the first allocation, the petitioner was allocated to the State of Chhattisgarh and respondent No.4 was allocated to the State of Madhya Pradesh and both applied for mutual allocation/transfer vide Annexure P-11-A, but the matter has not been finalized so far and respondent No. 4 has been called back to the State of Chhattisgarh and the case of the petitioner is still pending.

However, all the counsel representing their parties and appearing before this Court agree that this petition may be disposed of in terms of the order dated 17th April, 2007 passed by this Court in W.P.No.445/2001 and another connected W.P.No.446/1001.

Since a joint prayer is made on behalf of both the sides, this petition is disposed of in terms of the order already passed by this Court in W.P.No.445/2001 and the parties are directed to take necessary steps in accordance with para 14 of the aforesaid order.

The petitioner may also file the copies of writ petition as also any other documents which the petitioner desires necessary for disposal of his case.

The petition is finally disposed of.

No orders as to cost.

Sd/-
Sunil Kumar Sinha
Judge

emita